

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application. Claims 13 and 24 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Murakami, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,883,287, previously cited) PJR 11/18/03. Independent Claim 13 has been amended to define the first outer metal as being disposed around the stabilizer bar in engagement with the first elastomeric bushing. The first outer metal in Murakami, et al. is not disposed around the stabilizer as is now defined in amended Claim 13. In addition, the combination of Murakami, et al. with Roth, et al. does not suggest the stabilizer bar assembly as now defined in amended Claim 13 as discussed below. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 13, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 15 which depends from Claim 13 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the step of positioning the annular bushing around the stabilizer bar and the step of assembling an outer metal around the annular bushing and around the stabilizer bar. As discussed above, Murakami, et al. alone or combined with Roth, et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest the method now defined in amended Claim 24. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 24, as amended,

patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami, et al. in view of Roth, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection by the Examiner. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss this rejection. As discussed with the Examiner, if Roth, et al. is combined with Murakami, et al., the outer metal of Roth, et al. when replacing the outer metal of Murakami, et al. would require bolt 76 to extend through the outer metal and the bushing because Claims 1 and 7 define the outer metal as being disposed around the stabilizer bar. In addition, the flexibility of the system in Murakami, et al. which is provided by bushings 80A and 80B would be eliminated by an annular outer member disposed around the stabilizer bar because the outer metal does not provide flexibility along the axis of bolt 76.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1 and 7 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-4 which ultimately depend from Claim 1 and Claims 8-10 which ultimately depend from Claim 7 also patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami, et al. Claims 14 and 16 ultimately depend from Claim 13. Claim 27 depends from Claim 24. As discussed above, Applicants believe that Claims 13 and 24, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Applicants

believe that Claims 14, 16 and 27 also patentably distinguish over the art of record.
Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

Dated: January 28, 2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg